



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

INJUSTICE OF THE JUDGES

THE general tendency to criticise and to ridicule everything connected with the peace movement is not only unjust, but serious and dangerous. Pacifists can stand it to be called "unpatriotic" and "cowardly," even by such distinguished opponents as Mr. Roosevelt and others. All great movements have been ridiculed in the past by those who knew no better. As said by Baroness Bertha von Suttner: "There are three phases which every constructive movement has to pass through. In the first phase it is ridiculed; in the second it is antagonized; and in the third it is accepted as a matter of course." The peace movement has evidently entered the second phase. The militarist, lacking arguments, is resorting not only to ridicule, but to insult. The cartoonist amuses himself for the nonce by letting loose a vitriolic fancy in the form of a dove or Mr. Bryan.

But more to be regretted are the critics among the friends of peace, those who believe it to be rational, sane, and attainable. Thus the president of Harvard University, A. Lawrence Lowell, in an article, "A League to Enforce Peace," published in *The World's Work* of September, 1915, says:

"They (the pacifists) appear to think that war can be forever drowned out by a flood of talk; that the pen can grind the sword into a plowshare."

And Professor Hugo Münsterberg in the *New York Times* of September 19, in an article entitled "The Impeachment of German-Americans," says:

"It cannot be denied, however noble the pacifistic ideals are, their promoters have not succeeded as yet in proposing a single plan by which war would be abolished, and yet at the same time possibilities be given for the healthy growth of progressive peoples and for the historically necessary reduction of decadent nations."

And in a speech delivered before the Economic Club of Boston on February 8, 1915, Mr. August Schvan, of Sweden, said:

"It seems to me that the peace movement as it is today is nothing but a farce. What would we think if we would strive to root out crime by asking the criminals to join in societies for imposing certain rules upon each other? Does not modern criminology strive to remove the causes of crime and is not war in the present stage of the world a crime that must be dealt with in the same way?"

Many similar attempts to discredit this great, sincere, and most needed movement working for the good of mankind might be quoted. It is natural to ask whether these men realize what an enormous responsibility they are taking upon themselves by these continuous and unwarranted assaults against the peace movement, and whether they know if this country should be

drowned in a war to the extent of the European conflict that they would be guilty more than anybody else? It is by their ridicule and criticism that the peace movement is held back. It is they who prevent it from getting its full share of support from public opinion. This is a very serious responsibility.

Does not President Lowell see that his own statement is but another pail added to the "flood of talk?" Has Professor Münsterberg proposed "a single plan by which war would be abolished?" Can Mr. Schvan refuse to grant that if the peace movement is "a farce" the war movement is a farce raised to the *nth* power? Indeed, since this last critic calls the peace movement "a farce" and war "a crime," it must be that the self-satisfied gentleman must contemplate a third panacea to be known as the "Schvan movement," which will make neither for peace nor war, but possibly Nirvana.

SOME ERRONEOUS VIEWS OF THE PEACE MOVEMENT

IT WOULD seem to be of some importance that the principles of the peace movement should be clearly understood. They are not clearly understood, rather they are misrepresented widely, and they are attacked bitterly. These misrepresentations and attacks are often made by highly intelligent persons. It is impossible here to enumerate all of these misrepresentations and attacks; but a few may be briefly stated and answered. For example, we are told that:

"By ignoring the importance of force the pacifists forget the importance of establishing a foundation, support, or sanction for international law."

The answer to this is that the pacifists base their whole movement upon the only hopeful sanction of international law, the only real and ultimate sanction, the sanction of public opinion. Hugo Grotius, the father of international law, stated his view that the sanction of international law is based in nature. There have been those who hold that, since there is no compelling force behind international law, therefore international law cannot be binding; Puffendorf and Hobbes were of this opinion. There are those who place the sanction of international law in the common consent, in the customs, decisions, awards, and laws of men, that is to say, in humanity or public opinion; Bynkershoek ably defended this last view. Mr. Elihu Root, Dr. James Brown Scott and others place the sanction for international law in public opinion. And it is this last view to which the American Peace Society subscribes.

Another:

"The present world war is sufficient evidence that the policies of the pacifists are intolerable."

The answer to this charge is that it is not a statement of fact. The policies of the pacifists have unfortunately received scant attention from the nations now at war. The policies of the European nations may be summarized in the words of Dr. Charles W. Eliot: "There is no government and no court of the world which does not rest ultimately on force." Since this has been the supreme policy of the nations now at war, we are justified in the conclusion that it is not our program, but it is the policy which has failed. It has been faith in force, not faith in law, that has tumbled our world into war.

Again:

"The peace societies have no plan for the solution of the problem of war, at least any plan that is at all promising."

The reply to this is that the peace societies have a plan, and that it is promising. They have had this plan for nearly a century. The war notwithstanding, the plan is a hopeful plan. The plan is that there shall be an organization of the nations which shall function as a substitute for international war. Law must supplant the anarchy of the world. The details of this plan were specifically set forth in 1840 by William Ladd, founder of the American Peace Society, in his essay entitled "A Congress of Nations." In this essay Mr. Ladd forecast essentially all that has been accomplished at The Hague in 1899 and in 1907. A juridical union of the nations interfering with the autonomy of none, but stating and interpreting the international justice for all, that is the plan. We already have a court of arbitration which has demonstrated its practicability and serviceability repeatedly. The nations of the world agreed in principle to the international Supreme Court at the second Hague Conference. Opponents of the peace movement need to study their lessons.

And this:

"The pacifists believe in disarmament, in peace at any price, and are, therefore, an unpatriotic and dangerous group."

The answer to this charge is that it is not true.

Finally:

"Wars always have been and always will be."

The answer to this is that wars are made by men. What is made by men can be stopped being made. War has been condemned by every genuine leader of humanity. Jefferson called it "the greatest of human evils"; Emerson, "an epidemic of insanity." War runs counter to the laws of life and right-reason. War is, therefore, doomed to cease. The principles of life and justice are the principles of peace. Peace is, therefore, right and desirable; and what is right and desirable, as God lives, shall become permanent.

EDITORIAL NOTES

Powerful Military States Not Necessary. One of the ancient fallacies out of which have grown the suspicions, the fears, and the hatreds which have led to all wars is the notion that powerful military States are necessary for the promotion of the common weal. The appetite for world empire, developed from such a conception, has strewn the past with the bones of otherwise glorious peoples. The rise and decay of Persia is a case in point. The birth and extension of the Roman Empire, ending in its decline and fall, is familiar. The resurrection of the Holy Roman Empire by Charlemagne so that it lived again, but only so long as did he, is another significant illustration. The Mohammedans and the Tartars were overcome by this hunger. One of the saddest pages in all history is the gradual breakdown, through greed, of the great Spanish Empire. Forgetting neither Great Britain nor Napoleon, one of the greatest historians of our modern time recently confessed that in his judgment the era of great States is passing away. The great contributions of ancient Israel, of Greece and Italy and Switzerland and Holland, permanent contributions to the thought, the religion, the art, the law, the liberty, and the justice of the world, have had no relation to bulk or boundaries. As recently pointed out by that statesman and friend of America, Viscount Bryce, of Great Britain, the England of Shakespeare and the United States of Washington were no larger than Denmark, while Germany, the real Germany, the Germany of Kant, Lessing, Goethe, Hegel, Schiller, Fichte, was no nation at all.

Charlatanry, Chauvinism, and Curmudgeonism. A charlatan is one who parades a knowledge which he does not possess. A chauvin is a hyper-heated patriot whose enthusiasm runs primarily to brass bands and guns. A curmudgeon is an avaricious churl, a grasping, self-exploiting egotist.

In this era of investigations, of efficiency experts and scientific analyses, it ought not to be wholly without profit if Congress were to appoint a commission to investigate our American state of mind from the standpoint of these impressive and suggestive three C's. Only a little imagination would be needed to make such an investigation interestingly illuminating and significantly pat. By dividing our population into two classes, say, for euphony, *Rooseveltian Rag-timers* and *Pacifist Poltroons*, the commission might, with the aid of a few alienists, be able scientifically to discover where these pathological C's most prevail. Would it not be an infinite comfort to the Rooseveltian school could they diagnose pacifism in terms a bit more derogatory and satisfying than just plain "craven" and "eunuch"? If only among the other disreputable things the pacifists